

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-5 and 29 are now pending in the application. Minor amendments to Claim 1 are of an equivalent scope as originally filed and, thus, are not a narrowing amendment. Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to applicant's representative during a telephone interview on December 18, 2003 and January 14, 2003. During that interview, the Examiner indicated that the arguments as set forth below overcome the rejections based on U.S. Patent No. 6,255,741 and its Japanese equivalent. However, the Examiner and the applicant's representative were not able at that time to reach agreement as to the rejections based on U.S. Patent No. 5,824,177. Although agreement was not reached at that time, applicant believes the arguments set forth below traverse the Examiner's rejections. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of remarks contained herein.

### **INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

Applicant has numerous co-pending applications directed to subject matter similar to the present application. The Examiner has raised concerns that the Applicant met its duty to disclose in the present application. Applicant believes that all information material to the patentability of the present application has been submitted to or otherwise considered by the Examiner. However, applicant will review such co-pending applications to ensure it has met its duty to disclose.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,255,741 (Yoshihara) or an equivalent, Japanese Patent No. 2000-31349. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Yoshihara does not constitute prior art in relation to the present application in accordance with 35 U.S.C. 103(c). Yoshihara qualifies as a prior art reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). However, Applicant hereby asserts that the subject matter of the present application and Yoshihara were, at the time the invention was made, under an obligation to be assigned to the same entity, Denso Corporation. Applicant also notes that the publication of the Japanese equivalent patent document is not prior art in relation to the present application. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,824,177 (Yoshihara) or an equivalent, Japanese Patent No. 9-27466. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Yoshihara is directed generally to a method for manufacturing a semiconductor device. Of interest, Yoshihara discloses an adhesive sheet 2 which covers the surface of a semiconductor wafer 1 as shown in Figure 4A. During the interview with the Examiner, the Examiner indicated that Yoshihara teaches that the adhesive sheet 2 may warp during a heating step (e.g., referring to col. 3, line 50 thru col. 4, line 37). Thus, the adhesive sheet 2 may have areas

of varying height. The Examiner construes this as disclosing Applicant's claimed invention.

Applicant's claimed invention is similarly directed to a semiconductor device. In particular, Claim 1 recites that "the adhesive portion having a specific region having an adhesion less than that of a vicinal region of the adhesive portion surrounding the specific region". This claim language explicitly describes the adhesive characteristic of the specific region as being smaller or less than the surrounding regions, not the height of the specific region. As previously argued, the adhesive force of the adhesive material in Yoshihara is uniform across the entire surface of the adhesive sheet 2. Thus, Yoshihara does not teach or suggest a specific region of the adhesive portion having a less adhesive characteristic than a vicinal region surrounding the specific region. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1, along with the claims depending therefrom, are patentability distinct over Yoshihara. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

#### **ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**


The Examiner states that claim 3 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicant has elected to rewrite the objected to claim as new Claim 30.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: JAN. 19, 2004

By: 

Timothy D. MacIntyre

Reg. No. 42,824

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

RECEIVED  
JAN 22 2004  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800